

REMARKS

The Examiner's recognition of Applicants' invention by the indication of allowable

subject matter for claims 18-23 and 26 is gratefully acknowledged.

At page 1, a serial number is provided for a concurrently filed application.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 102 and 103

Claims 1- 17 and 27-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103 based upon Powell.

No patent to Powell is listed in the Notice of References Cited, or in the remarks in the Office Action.

The undersigned appreciates the phone call from the Examiner on January 13, 2005, made in response to the undersigned voice message, particularly in view of the sad circumstances that had called the Examiner away from the office. At the time of the call, the Examiner did not have the file or missing patent number, but indicated he would provide the patent number upon his return, with a new period to respond. Applicants are filing this document to be responsive to the outstanding Office Action, even though unable to fully address the issues raised therein.

Applicants request that the claims be allowed, and look forward to further communication from the Examiner.

Claims 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based upon United States Patent No. 2,704,035, issued to Bader in 1955. Applicants' have reviewed Bader, and note differences in the present invention, but cannot adequately comment or consider amendment to the claims until reviewing the Powell reference applied in the rejection of the remaining claims.

If it would further prosecution of the application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned at the phone number provided.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 50-0831.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas D. Fekete
Reg. No. 29,065
Delphi Technologies, Inc.
Legal Staff – M/C 480-410-202
P.O. Box 5052
Troy, Michigan 48007-5052

(248) 813-1210

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please substitute the enclosed sheets 1/5 and 3/5, labeled "Replacement Sheets," for the

corresponding sheets presently in the case.

An objection was made to the drawings in that the check valves in Figs. 1 and 3 did not open toward the engine. Figures 1 and 3 have been amended to show the check valves opening toward the engine. It is requested that the amended drawings be accepted and that the objection be withdrawn.